

The City of Lake Forest
Building Review Board
Proceedings of May 1, 2019 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Building Review Board was held on Wednesday, May 1, 2019 at 6:30 p.m., at the City of Lake Forest City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois

Building Review Board members present: Chairman Ted Notz and Board members, Chris Bires, Jim Diamond, Ross Friedman, James Sykora, and Richard Walther

Building Review Board members absent: Fred Moyer

Staff present: Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development and Jennifer Baehr, Assistant Planner

1. Introduction of Board members and staff, overview of meeting procedures – Chairman Notz

Chairman Notz reviewed the role of the Building Review Board and the meeting procedures followed by the Board. He asked the members of the Board and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes of the April 3, 2019 meeting of the Building Review Board.

The minutes of the April 3, 2019 meeting were approved as submitted.

- 3. Consideration of a new residence on a 10-acre site at 270 E. Westleigh Road. Approval of a tree removal plan, conceptual landscape plan and overall site plan is also requested. The property is the site of a previously approved demolition. Owner: Westleigh Properties LLC (Jeff and Bridget Lupient) Representative: Austin Dupree & Keith Labutta, Northworks Architects Carrie Woleben-Meade & Sam Danenberger, Mariani Landscape**

Chairman Notz asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Mr. Dupree introduced the project and the Northworks and Mariani design team.

Mr. Labutta explained that the siting of the proposed residence is generally in the location of the residence that was previously on the property. He added that the location of the proposed residence is also on the high point of the property. He noted that the site has significant natural features such as two large Oak trees and a pond. He stated that the residence is angled in a southwest orientation to take advantage of the views across the property. He noted that the proposed location of the residence is

setback from the two significant Oak trees on the property to avoid impacting them as the property is developed. He stated that the proposed driveway follows a portion of the existing driveway, before curving to the northeast and then to the west, into the parking court, on the north side of the house. He stated that the driveway then extends to the parking court adjacent to the garage. He stated that the proposed grading on the site includes creating swales along the north and east sides of the property. He explained that grading is proposed around the residence to collect water and direct it first into the retention pond and then to the stormwater drainage ditch along the north side of Westleigh Road. He stated that a berm is proposed along the western edge of the pond to minimize over topping of the pond to the west during heavy rains.

Ms. Woleben-Meade stated that landscaping is proposed around the house and at key points on the property. She added that the design intent of the landscaping is to provide a natural and native look on the majority of the property, while the landscaping around the house will be in a traditional European style, consistent with the architecture of the proposed residence. She noted a cluster of trees along the driveway is proposed for removal to allow grading to allow water to drain away from the house. She stated that the area around the pond will be enhanced with landscaping. She noted that the existing buckthorn on the perimeter of the property will remain to serve as a visual barrier. She noted that evergreens will be added to provide screening around the driveway. She stated that an entry gate and walls are proposed on the driveway, near Westleigh Road.

Mr. Labutta stated that a series of terraces are proposed on the rear of the house for entertaining. He explained that the house was designed with a formal organized massing and clear hierarchy. He noted that the central mass is the primary volume, and as the house moves away from the center, there are smaller volumes. He explained that the residence will be limestone and will have traditional features. He noted that a composite material is proposed on the smaller masses on the east and west ends. He added that the composite material is a high quality product. He stated that the roof material on the main volumes of the house is slate with metal roofs on the smaller masses to the east and west. He added that the windows will be aluminum clad.

Ms. Baehr stated that this site was previously developed with a single family house and remnants of the previous development including the driveway, a detached garage and a shed still exist but will be removed. She explained that the proposed residence complies with zoning and building scale requirements and the overall design of the residence is consistent with the City's Design Guidelines and the applicable standards. She added that from the lowest point of existing grade to the tallest roof peak of the proposed residence measures 40 feet, the maximum allowable. She noted that the plans submitted for permit will need to clearly document the height to assure that the allowable height is not exceeded. She added that as-built drawings will be required to verify that the overall height does not exceed the 40 foot maximum. She stated that most of the proposed materials are natural with the exception of a composite product proposed for the trim, fascia and soffits on the smaller masses of the home. She explained that the tree removal plan shows a significant number of trees proposed for

removal. She stated that replacement tree inches will need to be reflected on the final landscape plan. She added that the petitioners will also need to work with a Certified Arborist prior to the permit submittal to prepare an updated tree survey since the survey that was provided is dated 2009. She noted that the updated tree survey is required to verify the replacement tree inches that will be required. She stated that the two significant Oak trees are located generally in the center of the property adding that protecting and preserving these trees is critical as the site is developed. She noted that a condition is recommended in the staff report to address protection of the trees. She stated that staff received a letter from the neighbor on the west side of the property expressing concerns related to drainage and grading and construction practices. She explained that drainage from the site has impacted the neighbor over the past year due to unauthorized clearing that occurred on the site and a blocked outlet from the pond. She noted a condition in the staff report that provides the opportunity for the neighbor to review the engineering plans when they are submitted for permit and provide input.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Dupree stated that no variances are requested. He added that the approximate square footage of the residence is 17,000 square feet. He explained that the composite material proposed on the secondary masses can be custom cut like wood, hold paint and have visual characteristics similar to wood. He noted that the material was chosen for its low-maintenance qualities and longevity.

Ms. Czerniak noted that in the past, the Board has supported limited use of synthetic materials and only when used in combination with natural materials.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Dupree stated that the profile of the soffit is a projecting limestone cove detail. He confirmed that the gutters, downspouts and the standing seam roofs are copper. He added that the spread between the seams on the metal roofs will either be 14 or 16 inches. He stated that the hipped dormers were inspired by French style precedents. He added that the dormers are intentionally understated. He stated that the dormers will be painted a dark grey to blend into the roof. He explained that various iterations involving the orientation of the residence were explored. He stated that the siting of the residence as presented was found to offer the most successful sequence and approach to the house. He noted that the residence is located approximately 100 feet from the north property line.

Board member Friedman commented that in his opinion, the southwest orientation of the residence appears awkward. He suggested consideration of siting the residence with a slight rotation to the south, orienting the front of the house more toward the east.

In response to Board member Sykora, Mr. Dupree stated that they style of the residence is not based on the varying styles of architecture found in the area because the property is very large with minimal visibility from the streetscape or surrounding properties. He stated however that the architectural style is consistent with the eclectic collection of architectural styles found in the community. He stated that there are no

plans to modify the public sidewalk along Westleigh Road.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Woleben-Meade stated a willingness to share the conceptual landscape plans with the neighbor.

In response to Board member Bires, Mr. Labutta stated that the chimney rises approximately 4 feet above the roof. He confirmed that there are three chimneys proposed.

In response to questions from Board member Bires, Ms. Woleben-Meade stated that the hardscape material for the parking court at the front of the house has not been selected yet, but will likely be a type of stone.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Labutta stated that it is likely that additional lighting will be proposed along the driveway however, a lighting plan has not yet been prepared.

In response to Board member Walther, Ms. Woleben-Meade stated that the proposed wall adjacent to the entry gate is stone. She added that the entry gate and walls will have directed lighting from the ground rather than light fixtures mounted on the wall. She explained that the property owners are considering fencing, probably a simple black fence, along the perimeter of the site, within the buckthorn buffer area.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Dupree stated that the roof valleys will be flashed with copper and covered with slate. He added that the snow guards will also be copper.

In response to questions from the Board, Ms. Woleben-Meade explained that there is about 5 feet of grade change in the area of the rear terraces requiring walls which will likely be limestone.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Dupree stated that the smaller masses on the east and west ends will use a white and cream color palette.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Labutta stated that the existing elevation across the area of the proposed residence is 692. He stated that the top of the finished floor will be approximately 12-18 inches above the existing grade.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Dupree confirmed that the dormers have minimal roof overhang.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Labutta stated that the span of roof connecting the projecting wing masses is a low-sloped roof with a parapet wall. He stated that a roof will not be visible beyond the parapet wall and pointed out that the parapet wall aligns with the cornice.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Ms. Woleben-Meade stated that the

timing of the site work will overlap with work on the house. She stated that some of the excavated material from the the house will remain on site and used for altering the grades.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that entry gates must be sited to allow vehicles, including a delivery truck, to pull on to the property, out of the parkway. She stated that the gate cannot exceed 7 feet from existing grade to the tallest part of the gate.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Ms. Woleben-Meade stated that a landscape lighting plan has not yet been developed. She explained that some lighting will be necessary along the driveway. She added that in this area, due to snow, down lights, or tree-mounted fixtures may be preferred.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Notz invited public comments.

In response to questions from Mr. Don McCoy, 190 E. Westleigh, Ms. Czerniak confirmed that the bonds are required to assure that work is completed in accordance with the approved plans.

In response to questions from Mr. McCoy, Mr. Dupree stated that they are currently working to select a contractor for the project. He added that the expected timeline for construction is 18-20 months.

In response to questions from Mr. McCoy, Ms. Woleben-Meade stated that the perimeter fencing is intended to be set back from the property line with the fence buries in the buckthorn around the perimeter of the site. She stated that Bleck Engineering prepared the grading plans based on a thorough study of the site.

In response to questions from Mr. McCoy, Ms. Czerniak stated that the City Engineer is well-aware of the large area that is tributary to the pond located in the southwest corner of the property. She noted that the City Engineer will review the final grading and drainage plans closely and she offered to provide a copy of the plans to Mr. McCoy. She noted that silt fencing will be required to be installed before construction begins and will be inspected by City staff prior to the issuance of a building permit. She stated that staff will regularly visit the site during construction to assure that the silt fencing remains in place to prevent siltation of the pond and the drainage ditch located along the north side of Westleigh Road. She added that a berm is proposed on the west side of the pond to help to alleviate water flows toward the neighboring property if the pond over tops.

In response to questions from Mr. McCoy, Ms. Woleben-Meade stated that the proposed berm will be higher than the existing berm. She noted that currently, there is a buildup of sediment in the pond adding that the pond will be cleaned as part of the site work.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairman Notz invited final comments from the Board. Hearing none, he invited a motion.

Board member Friedman made a motion to recommend approval of the residence, attached garage, driveway entrance treatment, conceptual landscape plan and the overall site plan based on the findings presented in this staff report and incorporating the Board's deliberations as additional findings. He stated that the motion is subject to the following conditions of approval.

1. Further study and thought shall be given to 1) the scale of the dormers in relation to other elements of the house and 2) the siting of the house, particularly the proximity and relationship of the motor court to the north property line.
2. The final plans shall provide detail and demonstrate satisfactory resolution, at the discretion of staff, of the following:
 - a. The detail of the flat roof and parapet wall element linking the main mass of the house to the wings.
 - b. The design, detailing and materials of the terrace walls.
 - c. The cornice dentils and coping shall be stone consistent with the detailing discussed at the Board meeting.
 - d. The flat roof elements shall be copper panels or a residential width.
3. Any modifications made to the plans that were presented to the Board, either in response to Board direction, or as the result of final design development, shall be clearly called out on the plan and a copy of the plan originally provided to the Board shall be attached for comparison purposes. Staff is directed to review any changes, in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate, to determine whether the modifications are in conformance with the Board's direction and approval prior to the issuance of any permits.
4. The overall height of the house, in combination with any grade changes, shall be carefully monitored to insure that the house, together with any increase of the grade above the existing condition, does not exceed 40 feet. As-built drawings shall be submitted at appropriate intervals to verify compliance with the height limitations.
5. At the time of submittal for a building permit, detailed drainage and grading plans must be submitted. No grading or filling shall be permitted except the absolute minimum necessary to meet accepted engineering standards and practices given the need to protect and preserve the significant Oak trees on the site and to avoid negative impacts from drainage on the neighboring property to the west.
 - a. A copy of the drainage and grading plan shall be provided to the owner of the downstream property, 190 Westleigh Road, for review and comment prior to final review and approval by the City Engineer.

6. Prior to submittal of plans and an application for a building permit an updated and complete tree survey and tree removal plan shall be submitted for the purpose of calculating the total tree inches proposed for removal. The plan will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist and the Arborist shall verify the replacement tree inches required on the site.
7. At the time of submittal for a building permit, a detailed, final landscape plan shall be submitted and will be subject to review and approval by the City's Certified Arborist. The plan shall reflect the required replacement tree inches using good forestry practices.
8. If perimeter fencing is proposed, it shall be sited back from the property line and obscured by vegetation. Details of the fence shall be provided and the fence shall be designed to minimize its visibility and preserve the landscape dominate character of the property from the streetscape and neighboring properties.
9. Details of all exterior lighting, lighting related to any structures, landscape lighting, lighting along the driveway or at the entrance, if any is proposed, shall be reflected on the plans submitted for permit. Cut sheets of all light fixtures shall be provided and all fixtures shall direct light downward and the source of the light shall be shielded from view from off the property by the fixtures and if not, then by frosted or beaded glass dense enough to obscure views of the light source. The right to night, dark sky goals shall be satisfied. All exterior lights shall be on timers and set to turn off no later than 11 p.m. except for lights with motion sensors. No up lighting of structures or walls is permitted.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a plan for construction parking and materials' staging shall be submitted for review and will be subject to approval by the City's Certified Arborist, City Engineer and Director of Community Development. All staging and parking shall be accommodated on the site. No parking on Westleigh Road is permitted.
11. Given the large scope of the project, every effort shall be made to proceed diligently with construction of the house and site work, running activities concurrently when possible, to achieve completion of the project within 18 to 20 months, consistent with the timeline represented at the Board meeting.

The motion was seconded by Board member Diamond and approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

- 4. Consideration of a request for revisions to previous approvals for a new hotel, Lake Forest Hyatt Place, in Conway Park, at 200 Field Drive. Changes are proposed to the building design and massing, windows, architectural details and signage. (Construction of the hotel is not yet underway.)
Owner: Laurel Avenue Lake Forest Ltd. Partnership
(Trilliam Investments, Inc., Gary Janko, Janko Financial Group, LLC, JFLT, LLC)**

Representative: Peter Dubin, Justin Colturi, and Wally Funk, Norr Architects

Chairman Notz introduced the project. He asked the Board members for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner.

Peter Dubin introduced the petition and the design team. He explained that the modifications to the previously approved plans are a result of changes to the interior floorplan and changes to the Hyatt Place prototype. He noted that no changes are proposed to the site and grading plans, lighting plan, or the signage. He stated that the hotel remains at five stories, with 159 guestrooms. He explained that the overall square footage of the hotel is reduced from the previous plan. He added that the indoor pool was removed. He reviewed that the changes made to the exterior of the hotel to make it appear more contemporary in style. He noted that a planar trapezoid element was added to serve as a backdrop and organizing element for the overall structure. He explained that large floor-to-ceiling windows were added to the east and west elevations and stated that the exterior materials were enhanced. He stated that the main entrance to the building was relocated from the center of the east elevation, to the north end of the east elevation and a glazed porte-cochere was added. He noted that the entry element features projecting metal canopies and glass fins. He explained that the west elevation of the building presents a simple, rectangular form. He noted that the east and west elevations are comprised of a pattern of metal panels of varying sizes, punched window openings, and a darker color palette. He stated that the mechanical equipment located on the roof will be hidden from view by the parapet wall.

Ms. Czerniak stated that the request before the Board is for approval of revisions to the previously approved plans. She noted that the previous approvals stand with the exception of the areas where changes are proposed. She reviewed that changes were made to the overall massing of the building, exterior materials and fenestration. She noted that clarification on the volumes that comprise the elevations is needed. She added that it is important that the hotel features a design that is compatible with other buildings located in Conway Park, while distinguishing itself as a hotel, and not an office building. She added that care should be taken to assure that the building does not appear trendy quickly appearing outdated.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Dubin stated that the height of the sloping trapezoid element may need to be modified once a mechanical system is selected to adequately screen the equipment located on the roof.

In response to questions, Ms. Czerniak stated that the City Code allows for a building in this area of up to 75 feet with the ability to screen mechanical equipment above that height to a limited degree. She added that it is staff's understanding that at the highest point, at the north end of the building, the height of the screening element reaches 77 feet. She noted that a height variance is currently not being requested, however if the height of the main mass of the building exceeds the maximum allowed

for the site, a variance will be needed.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Funk noted that the mechanical equipment will be relatively minimal for a building of this type.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Colturi stated that the metal panels on the north and south elevations will have varying widths and will be placed at staggered heights. He noted that the panels will also have varying levels of patina and coloring. He confirmed that the canopies above the building's main entrance are tapered. He explained that the north side of the entrance canopy is the deepest portion, and explained that as the canopy extends south, it tapers to approximately one foot.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Dubin explained that the canopies are not horizontal planes, but are open elements, comprised of individual members. He acknowledged that some modification may be required to prevent the build-up of water and ice on the canopies. He stated that the sidewalk below is pulled away from the building and as a result, water and ice from the metal canopies above should not fall on pedestrians. He stated that the exterior wall material at the north patio area is stone, to match the adjacent material. He stated that the glass used in the guestrooms is the same type used for the projecting glass element for the building's entrance.

Board member Walther commented that the glass fin extensions on the east elevation are somewhat distracting.

In response to questions from Board member Walther, Mr. Durbin stated that the glass fins are intended to articulate and add detail to the building. He confirmed that the masonry between the windows on the south side of the east elevation will match the stone on the north side of the elevation. He confirmed that the brick will be a 4 inch thick brick. He confirmed that the stone is small and human scaled. He noted that the stone will be applied in varying lengths.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Funk stated that the stone is sintered stone, not a concrete product.

Mr. Durbin added that stone could be used in place of the brick along the east elevation.

In response to questions from Board member Sykora, Ms. Czerniak stated that the original approval includes a condition directing City staff to work with Conway Park Owner's Association and the petitioner to consider opportunities for directional signage as needed.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Colturi stated that the masonry and metal materials proposed for the hotel, along with the simple

fenestration pattern, are intended to relate to the surrounding buildings in Conway Park.

Board member Friedman stated that the design of the hotel creates an appearance more in line with an apartment building than the surrounding high quality corporate office buildings in the office park.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Durbin explained that the intent was to create a sleek and well-detailed façade.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Janko reviewed the interior modifications that were driven by a change to the Hyatt Place prototype. He noted that the current design is more modern than the previously approved design. He stated that the landscape contractor for the project has not yet been selected.

In response to questions from Board member Diamond, Mr. Colturi stated that the top of the roof is set at 63'-9" and the parapet wall on the north and south sides at 70'-3".

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Durbin stated that the parapet wall on the east and west elevations is clad with a fiber cement wall panel and the north and south, the parapet wall is clad with metal panels.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Colturi noted the trash enclosure is located just south of the entrance, on the west elevation, adding that the area will be screened with an 8 foot wall. He explained that the height of the windows on the east side of the south elevation differs from the height of the other windows on the south elevation to accommodate furniture in the guestroom.

In response to questions from Chairman Notz, Mr. Janko confirmed that many Hyatt Place hotels are over parked. He noted that many guests utilize other means of transportation and do not require on-site parking. He stated that the parking lot on the west side of the property is intended for the future office building and will not be constructed at the time the hotel is built.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Chairman Notz invited public comments.

Stephen Wright, Wright Heerema Architects, stated that he was involved with the original design of the hotel. He stated that, in his opinion, the modified design responds well to the changes to the Hyatt Place prototype.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairman Notz invited final comments from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Friedman, Mr. Janko confirmed that final engineering plans are being developed. He confirmed that detention is located off-site, as part of the overall detention for Conway Park.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Chairman Notz invited a motion.

Board member Friedman made a motion to recommend approval of the revisions to previously approved plan for the proposed Hyatt Place Hotel. He stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and added that the deliberations of the Board are incorporated as additional findings. He stated that the motion includes the following conditions.

1. The plans submitted for permit shall be fully detailed with respect to architectural elements, dimensions and exterior materials and shall demonstrate resolution of the open issues identified by the Board.
 - a. The siding materials on the north and south elevations shall vary in pattern, thickness and patina from panel to panel to provide visual interest to the flat facades.
 - b. The plans shall demonstrate that the various architectural elements including the fins and tapered awnings, will not present a hazard of falling ice or snow to pedestrians below.
 - c. The patio wall materials separating the patio and the parking lot shall be stone.
 - d. The plans shall fully detail the trash enclosure.
2. Any changes or refinements made to the plans presented to the Board shall be clearly called out and will be subject to review by staff in consultation with the Chairman as appropriate.
3. All roof top mechanicals, including the elevator over run, shall be fully screened from all views from off the site, from all directions.
4. The submittal for building permit shall include a detailed, full size landscape plan which will be subject to review and final approval by the City's Certified Arborist.
 - a. The landscape plan shall provide for screening of pedestrian walkways and gathering areas with landscaping, walls or fences, alone or in some combination, to provide protection of those areas from the parking lot.
 - b. At the time of plantings, in the field adjustments should be made in consultation with the City's Certified Arborist based on plant materials that are available and adjustments that are deemed appropriate as development of the site takes shape.
 - c. Careful attention shall be paid to full implementing the landscape plan to maintain a landscape dominate character along the Field Drive streetscape.
5. The submittal for building permit shall include detail on any and all exterior lighting proposed on the site. Detail on the fixture type, location and area of illumination shall be provided. No building up lighting is approved and if proposed in the future, will require review by the Building Review Board.

- a. Intensity of the site lighting shall be subject to review and approval by staff after installation. If determined to be appropriate, lowering the intensity of lighting in the later evening hours may be required by staff. '
6. The height of the light poles in the parking lot and around the building shall be clearly called out on the plans submitted for permit and shall be consistent with parking lot lights throughout Conway Park.
7. The submittal for permit shall include detailed drawings of the monument sign and sign at the top of the building on the west elevation. Drawings shall detail the proposed materials, how the letters will be mounted and details of the lighting proposed.
 - a. The signage lighting shall be limited to ground lighting or back lighting.
 - b. A plan for any directional or informational signage on the site shall be submitted, shall be in conformance with the Conway Park signage regulations, and be subject to staff review and approval.
 - c. City staff is directed to work with the Conway Park Owners' Association and the petitioner to evaluate the opportunity for directional signage in Conway Park and on Route 60 in an effort to assist in getting people to the hotel.
8. All conditions of the previous approval shall be adhered to unless superseded by the above conditions.

The motion was seconded by Board member Diamond and approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

OTHER ITEMS

4. Opportunity for the public to address the Building Review Board on non-agenda items.

There was no additional public testimony presented to the Board.

5. Additional information from staff.

No additional information was presented from staff.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Baehr
Assistant Planner